

HONEST JOHN BURNS SADLY DISCOMFITED

Labor Leader in British Parliament Is Mark for Socialist Leader Because of Asquith's Overriding of Burns on Unemployed Grant.

London, Jan. 6.—When the Prime Minister, Mr. Herbert Asquith, came the other day for the relief of those he employed, he was careful to pay a compliment to John Burns. It was more than an ordinary compliment. Asquith, for once in his life, was referring to the exterior. John Burns, as a man who had had long and arduous nights wrestling with this great social problem. And John, sitting a couple of yards away from him on the treasury bench, modestly inclined his head under the shower of fair words and the compliment was very touching. That is Asquith has no great love for John Burns, but does not care to slight the educated people. There is a real deal of academic pedantry about him. You can see it in the way he carries his own style. He is very critical in his attitude to other people, and the way he carries John Burns, who makes hay of the King's English when he fairly gets into his oration, is a good example.

Other things about John, upon whom it has been said, are not at all complimentary. He is not well with Campbell-Bannerman, who gave him his head, and never troubled him. There is a marked difference when Asquith came along.

Asquith has not even found a master.

He has not even found a treasure bench, job as he always tried to sit next to Campbell-Bannerman, in the hope of getting him to be consulting with him. But everybody westminster knows exactly how things stand. John is not even found a father. And John knows that he is.

The Love of Labor.

Why, then, did Asquith make such a point of calling the Labor when he did? The Labor members could answer the question readily enough, but not John in the chamber with which the members of the House endorsed the tribute. They do not know. They did not know and they do not go. That is all.

He did not even trouble to look to see whether the men he was addressing were the sons of the man. And they know that the Prime Minister's speech did not even bring up the fact that John had been beaten on this question of dealing with the unemployed.

When Asquith left the House, not only that the unemployed grant was to be administered, but also that it was to be administered in a more flexible and liberal manner. This, so far as the position of the Labor party concerned, was the crux of the matter. The Labor men have complained all the time of the *thrift* of John.

John has not his fare dead against anything in the nature of extravagance, but he is not a man of what, to their disgust, he is hopefully described as "other people."

Assault Knows the Game.

The Labor Socialists would spend every penny available and then take for more. John, by hard driving, has saved the unemployed grant in the fact. Having been a labor agitator himself, John knows the type of men he is dealing with. Asquith gives him greater delight than to thwart and irritate and to make the men who work for him. His heart is great in his antipathy to them, at it has not only hardened them, but it has led him into extraneous extravagances on the treasury bench, upon which Asquith has had to sit with a heavy eye.

For Asquith has learned that the Labor party must not be harassed. He has to be given an easy time to an open and unavoidable quarrel with them over the light treatment given to the unemployed in the days of the depression. It is game to keep them fairly quiet, and he is not going to have to sacrifice his own principles in order to keep John Burns in his love of show pictures.

So when the announcement was made that the central unemployed fund is to be administered in a more liberal manner, all knew that John had put his foot down, and that Honest John had a setback.

However, he is not alone in his merits, we are all in a very sympathetic mood, but the Labor men themselves are not about to let him off.

John Burns, in his love of show pictures, means that they had beaten him that chess game. And Asquith was very far from desiring to throw John to the wolves. He was resolved that he would not sit alone, but that he did not want to make it too easy for the Labor men to kick him.

He was not alone in his enthusiasm and self-sacrifice.

It was all done in the best English parliamentary tradition.

AN EMBARRASSING LEGACY.

French Countess Leaves Racing Stable on an Archipelago.

Paris, Jan. 2.—The Archipelago of Paris, Monte Carlo, recently received an embarrassing legacy in the form of a racing stable.

The testatrix was a French countess, who resided at the Chateau d'Albionville, in the Somme, and in a manor house in the same department.

The viscountess consulted Monsieur Anne, her sole legatee, much to the latter's surprise, as the viscountess had no personal acquaintance with her.

The legacy comprised the whole of the viscountess' estate, which includes several thousand acres, together with a staff of stable boys and girls.

A fresh embarrassment awaited the archipelago when he decided to dispose of the racing stable, and to sell the stable to a well-known firm the managers of another establishment claiming the viscountess' name.

The ground on which were Roman Catholics, while the others were Protestants and Jews.

LONDON TO GRAPPLE WITH TRAFFIC PROBLEM.

Unstrained Growth of Travelling Facilities Has Resulted in Dangerous Overloading.

A SPECIAL PORT FOR GIANTS OF THE OCEAN

Unstrained Growth of Travelling Facilities Has Resulted in Dangerous Overloading.

Wembury Bay Chosen as Site for Proposed Haven for Big Ships—Small Craft Will Be Permitted to Enter New Harbor—Breakwaters Required.

London, Jan. 6.—Yet further growth in the size of ships depends rather upon the civil engineer than upon the marine architect. The shipbuilder is compelled to construct seagoing facilities far larger than even those that have been built, and the last few miles are being framed this winter, and there is a great deal of tunneling under the streets.

With all this means in favor, the old trade. First of all, let us consider the number of passengers carried by steamship in the years 1903 and 1907. The figures are as follows:

1903. 1907.

11,748 (total). 29,722,680.

Passenger. 394,356 531.

Freight. 287,586,471 520,985.

Omibus. 287,586,471 520,985.

Total. 972,465,882 1,261,470.

The total number of passengers greater London in 1903 was 8,786,233, and in 1907 it was 2,217,538.

Thus, in the last four years the rate of growth of passenger per head of the population was 142.9, and in 1907 it was

14.9. These figures show a great growth of the traveling habit in London, but the figures do not tell the whole story.

At the total number of vehicles in London, each Londoner would have to have 1.25 vehicles.

Now these figures show a great growth of the traveling habit in London, but the figures do not tell the whole story.

What is the cost of this?

